DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 148 08 VT 008 433

Leadership Development Seminar for State Directors of Vocational Education. Final Report.
Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Bureau No-BR-7-0158
Pub Date Apr 69
Grant-OEG-3-7-000158-2037
Note-38p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
Descriptors-Agency Role, *Conference Reports, Curriculum Development, Educational Philosophy, Federal Laws, *Leadership Training, Professional Training, *Program Planning, Speeches, State Departments of Education, *Vocational Directors, *Vocational Education
Identifiers-*National Leadership Development Seminar, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968

State directors, assistant state directors, and other national leaders in vocational education from 35 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico attended a national leadership development seminar on August 6-9, 1968 to exchange ideas concerning new and exemplary programs in vocational and technical education. Major objectives were: (1) to discuss topics of vital concern in planning and implementing vocational and technical education programs, (2) to provide information in the latest and most relevant research, and (3) to provide planning alternatives for "tuning up" for expanded vocational education programming in the future. Five papers presented to provide a springboard for discussion participants were: (1) "The Relationship of Vocational Education to the Total Elementary and Secondary Program" by D. Allen, (2) "Implications of the Vocational Amendments of 1968," by L. Burkett, (3) "Total Training Responsibility of the State Department of Vocational Education," by L. Minear, (4) "Professional Improvement of Staff," by C. Steinmetz, and (5) "New and Emerging Philosophies of Vocational Education," by J. Walsh. (DM)

ED029148

FINAL REPORT

On a Project Conducted Under
Project No. 7-0158
Grant No. OEG-3-7-000158-2037

# LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR FOR STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

April 1969

VT008433

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
On a Project Conducted Under
Project No. 7-0158
Grant No. OEG-3-7-000158-2037

# LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR FOR STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Final Report

THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

April 1969

The training program reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Bureau of Research
RMP66000

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Page

PREFACE . . . . . v

PAPERS

"The Relationship of Vocational Education to the Total Elementary and Secondary Program"
by Dwight Allen . . . . . 1

"Implications of the Vocational Amendments of 1968"
by Lowell Burkett . . . . . 9

"Total Training Responsibility of the State Department of Vocational Education"
by Leon Minear . . . . . 17

"Professional Improvement of Staff"
by Cloyd Steinmetz . . . . . 25

"New and Emerging Philosophies of Vocational Education"
by John P. Walsh . . . . . 31

# PREFACE

On August 6 through 9, 1968, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education sponsored a National Leadership Development Seminar for State Directors of Vocational Education. Participating in this Seminar were state directors, assistant state directors, and other national leaders in vocational education from 35 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to exchange ideas concerning new and exemplary programs in vocational and technical education.

Primary objectives of the Seminar were to discuss certain topics of vital concern to state directors of vocational education in the planning and implementing of vocational and technical education programs in their states. Further, to provide information on the latest and most relevant research, and to provide planning alternatives for "tooling up" for expanded vocational education programming in the future.

At this Seminar, five outstanding papers were presented to provide a springboard for discussion by the participants. This report is a compilation of these five presentations.

Robert E. Taylor, Director
The Center for Vocational
and Technical Education

# THE RELATIONSHIP OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO THE TOTAL ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PROGRAM

by

Dwight Allen

I do not think we have determined the relationship of vocational education to the total academic program. I am not certain whether it is because vocational education is changing rapidly, or whether the secondary program is changing rapidly, or whether it is because neither one of them is changing rapidly enough. At any rate, I think we can agree that they are not very well put together.

I was at Stanford University recently before going to the University of Massachusetts. While I was there we conducted a four-year study of the Application of Computer Generated Flexible Scheduling to Vocational-Technical Education.

We learned a lot in that four-year period. One of the totally unanticipated areas we had to get into was the relationship between the academic curriculum and the vocational-technical program. We had not considered this as a major thrust of our project originally, but it eventually became an important aspect of our research. One of the programs we studied was a distributive education program that had just been developed in the State of Nebraska. As we studied this program we found that more than 50 percent of the total curriculum called for was English instruction. We asked the developer of the program why, in a vocational program, are you offering all this instruction in English? The answer, a very reasonable answer, was that the English Departments didn't give appropriate instruction in English. So we pursued the problem and asked the English, as well as Social Studies, Math, and Science Departments, what they had done recently for vocational education? The answer was they hadn't even thought about vocational education; in fact they wished that vocational education would disappear. This, unfortunately, is the typical attitude that one encounters; the English teachers are much too busy teaching Shakespearean sonnets to be bothered by some of the things vocational educators would prefer them to teach.

We held a series of conferences to consider how this curriculum division could be improved. I must confess I'm very discouraged at our progress, because the English teachers are still teaching Shakespearean sonnets and the likelihood is that they will continue to do so. Therefore, one of the major problems that I see facing secondary education is a problem shared jointly by vocational educators and the academicians in the secondary program - how should we organize the curriculum.

---

Dwight Allen is the Dean of Education at the University of Massachusetts.

I think it is simply unacceptable to have large blocks of our program taught for irrelevant reasons. I recently had the opportunity to serve as a consultant to a labor union that was developing an apprentice program for surveyors, rear chainmen, head chainmen, and heads of party. One thing they were very proud of was that they had instituted a requirement of the completion of a course in trigonometry before you could be accepted in the program. However, the kind of person that would appropriately be in a rear chainmen apprentice program is not a person that one normally would expect to be able to complete a course in trigonometry. We studied the trigonometry requirement and found that there are four or five basic principles of trigonometry a rear chainman needs to know, and these can probably be taught to the student in two days. The requirement for a course in trigonometry was simply a status symbol for the apprentice program.

I think this is symptomatic of one of the real problems that vocational and technical education faces. Vocational education is so status conscious that it always wants to improve the quality of its students. I would like to find a vocational program that wants to take those students below the students that anyone else wants to take. Unfortunately, our society has accepted the idea that the hallmark of a program is related to constantly raising standards. I would like to pose as an alternative that a new hallmark might be programs with constantly lowering standards, lowering standards in deliberate ways to conserve and expand the clientele. I'm concerned, for example, that a vocational school that we've been working with sends 50 percent of its students on to college, while only 30 percent of the students in the comprehensive high schools in the same city go on to college. One of the big problems is not the way in which the program succeeds, but the people who never make it into the program. Estimates indicate that as high as 70 percent of the people for whom these programs are designed never see the programs. There are a variety of reasons why and many are related conditionally to staff.

Most vocational schools have a favorite status. For example, any student who doesn't make the grade in a vocational school gets sent back to the comprehensive high school. I can't defend this in terms of the relationship between vocational education and the comprehensive program in a secondary school; it is completely immoral and indefensible. On the other hand, neither can I defend the English teacher teaching Shakespearean sonnets to all comers, regardless of the relationship to any practical experience that the student is likely to encounter. I am emphasizing the stereotypes to try to emphasize what I see as one of the major issues.

However, I think that there are some very hopeful things on the horizon. I think, for example, we might use wider representations of people when we start comprehensive curriculum revisions. These people should give consideration to generating a wide range of alternatives for students in gaining credit units for graduation requirements. If we can put in that kind of reinforcement on one side and a willingness to compromise clientele standards on the other side, we might then be able to develop a curriculum that is much more relevant.

There are some profound issues that we're going to have to face. One is that the skill needs of society are changing, and we do not have the mechanism to change the curriculum as those needs change. Consequently, our programs and facilities are often completely and hopelessly outmoded. Furthermore, if we look at dollars spent for programs and facilities, particularly in the trade and industrial areas, in relation to the clientele served, we cannot come up with a cost efficiency ratio that anyone can defend.

Another issue is related to overtraining. It's no more true in vocational education than in any other area, but that doesn't exempt vocational education from the problem. There are, for example, heavy truck driver courses that include instruction on deisel engines. However, most trucking companies won't let a truck driver get close to an engine. If the engine breaks down, the only thing he is allowed to do is call the repairman. There are programs to train hotel maids that go on for long periods of time. However, we can demonstrate that a six hour program will adequately prepare a hotel maid. In other words, we are inclined to make much too big a deal out of things. I will depressurize the situation by not just speaking of vocational educators. Some of the surveys show that professional engineers use only 20 percent of their four-year program of preparation in a typical engineering situation.

What we are really suffering from is an excessive dose of credentialism--professional or technical. I use the words interchangeably, because the connotation is the same from my point of view. It has the connotation of some sort of skill or judgment. In new sophisticated technical areas, there is always judgment involved. However, as the areas develop and you get more experienced, the need for judgment goes down. What may be an area requiring great judgment initially, eventually becomes routinized to a point where that judgment is no longer needed. Things become predictable. When the first deisel engine locomotive broke down, they called an engineer to fix it. He came and tapped and turned a couple of parts, and gave them a bill for $1,000.00. The railroad company was very distraught with the bill, so they asked him to itemize his statement. His statement:

Tapping one widget - $.25
Turning one wheel - $.25
Knowing which widget to tap and which wheel to turn - $999.50

The point is that in that stage of development of diesel engines, it was a mystery to know which parts to tap and which parts to turn. Ten years later there was enough expertise around so that no one needed a $1,000 engineer to come out and tap and turn.

If you are not careful you will get locked into a structure which will require the ministration of a $1,000 engineer to tap and turn, because of the professionalism of a credentialism that has grown up. We see the same thing in teaching. We don't let anyone near the students without credentials. It turns out, however, there are many things you can do with students for which you don't need a credential. There is no school administrator in his right mind that would let a class of

students be out in the swimming pool without a teacher to supervise and guard. This is a matter of public liability. However, there is a slight nonsequitur in the fact that in the summer the community swimming pool is operated by the recreation commission and all you need to supervise the swimming is a senior life guard, who might be a student. Something is phony somewhere. It becomes apparent, therefore, that professionals love to develop an aura of mysticism around the activities they perform. This aura of mysticism sets them apart from mortals and gives them their rank and status. It is rare when a professional will downgrade his own text and recognize that it is no longer a matter of magnificent judgment, but rather a matter of routine administration.

The only time that you get a professional to willingly compromise the status of a professional task is in times of extreme professional shortage. Then they miraculously find that they can use technicians for certain kinds of things and assistants for other kinds of things and still achieve a structure of perfection. Our programs in secondary education and vocational technical education need to reflect the idea of this kind of differentiation. We have to be willing to make little deals out of things that are little deals, as well as big deals out of things that are big deals.

We should always be looking for the minimum program of preparation instead of the maximum program of preparation. Bob Mager once conducted an efficiency study for an electronics firm. In a week and a half program they were preparing people for checking gages in an assembly line. The problem was that if you didn't read or interpret the numbers correctly you got action on your calibrating gages. They had quite a large turnover on that assembly line, so they were providing eight to ten days of on-the-job training to prepare people to perform on this quality control line. Mager thought he could design a much more efficient training program, so he developed a set of programmed materials that presented the information so that it could be covered in a three hour course. He then demonstrated that he could train women to do as good a job in quality control as the company was getting them to do in a week and a half. He was pretty proud of himself. He got a control group then, and gave them the final criterion test, without either taking the on-the-job training or the three and a half hour training program. It turned out that they did just as well, because the base line competence was already 99 percent of what we thought we had to do all that training for.

A lot of that goes on in school at all levels. We have students cowed into thinking that it is all right to have to see and participate in the same things over and over again. There was a Nevada program for highway technicians where they were taking about a 225 hour program that qualified you to do another 225 hour program; you could enter at the advanced levels if you could demonstrate completion of a 450 hour highway technician program. The point is that in vocational education, which has for years been leading education in establishing definite performance criteria, it seems like a complete nonsequitur to have all this hours nonsense. If we believe anything about individual differences, we know that the number of hours someone studies something is irrelevant.

The typical national standard is to define vocational programs in terms of hours. Somehow, we have to eliminate that nonsense. We have to devise some sort of criteria which are independent of time spent in training.

This time criteria problem isn't just vocational education. You get credit for ninth grade English by keeping the ninth grade English seat warm for thirty six weeks, five hours a week. Some students enter ninth grade English knowing more than other students know when they finish ninth grade English successfully. But you get the credit for keeping the seat warm. If ever there was a problem that is facing secondary education in general, and vocational education in particular, it is eliminating this seat warming business. Somehow we have to define better criteria and be willing to get a better perspective on what we are doing. We have objectives that have been defined from our limited perspective for so long that we fail to see the legitimacy of any other perspective.

Unfortunately, we get a great myopia in terms of knowing so much about the subject that we don't see any alternatives. We know so much about what goes into curriculums that we don't see alternatives to what is there. For example, in most curriculums that have to do with salesmanship or cash registry we have some mathematical components. However, what used to be a very valuable skill, namely the skill of mental arithmetic, is now genuinely irrelevant. No one will even let a clerk add up a grocery bill by hand. Despite this, we are still teaching the process of mental arithmetic as a necessary requisite for certain kinds of skills. The way in which the skills change are not reflected either in the academic program or the vocational program, and they should be.

We need to recognize the downgrading of training for most positions from two points of view. One is routinization and the other is specialization. In many areas of concern, specialization is so unique as to make general preparation obsolete. The best example I can cite is bookkeeping. Almost every vocational bookkeeping course teaches double entry bookkeeping. Less than three percent of the people hired in bookkeeping positions ever see both sides of the ledger, however. Their position is so specialized that they work on a very minute section of the ledger. The principle of double entry bookkeeping is a principle that is completely obsolete from the point of view of the practicing bookkeeper. I am not against conceptual understanding, but to require a conceptual understanding of bookkeeping for someone who is going to work in a bookkeeping data processing center is irrelevant.

We have not yet recognized the irrelevancy in our curriculum. If we were to look, for example, at the ratio of technical and trade and industrial employment with that of service areas, we would find more than 70 percent of the employment in the service areas of trade and industry. However, 70 percent of the attention of vocational educators is not devoted to service industries. In fact, you act often as though you wished that distributive education and vocational home economics would be eliminated because they don't fit the major mold. They aren't as comfortable as the old mainline courses we know so well. However,

those good old mainline courses are a minority in the field. One of the reasons it seduces us is because it is much easier to know when you have a crank shaft. That has beginning and ending points; you can definitely place it and it will stay there. However, if you are training someone to be a hotel maid, that isn't either glamorous or so satisfying. It turns out, however, that there is more need for hotel maids.

I am not against the culinary arts program, although I am against some of the things that are done in the culinary arts programs. Some culinary arts programs include courses in nutrition. Yet most people who are working in culinary arts applications are not going to be concerned about nutrition, for they will have no control over the menu. I can't see that this is vocationally relevant. In the academic area we are teaching students about esoteric things in the area of science. If we could predict their rate of interest and vocational concern in general education requirements, we would be confronting students with science that would be totally different.

One of the biggest areas of concern has to be re-dividing of the field--a reconceptualization of the relationship between vocational education and general education. One of the largest contributions of vocational education to general education needs to be a reconceptualization of the whole process of vocational choice. Vocational educators have not involved themselves in the act early enough. They disdain free vocational education. In our research we were so naive that we included a junior high school in the project of vocational application to practical scheduling. We got our wrists slapped because we didn't know the difference between vocational and pre-vocational. That is part of the problem--pre-vocational education isn't done enough. Vocational choice for 80 percent of the students is a completely haphazard thing. It is haphazard at all levels incidentally--90 percent of the students who enter higher education cannot give you a definite career objective. The poor students who don't enter college are supposed to know what they want to do as soon as they graduate. I would like to think about pre-vocational education in terms of broadening the list of experiences right at the beginning of the educational program, starting as early as pre-school. It would be helpful to determine the purposes and alternatives of curriculum development in terms of this very important area of vocational choice, because maybe ultimately vocational choice is the most central issue of vocational education at the secondary level and below.

It may be that as jobs become more and more specialized that on-the-job training becomes more and more appropriate within the context of actual employment, because it is already becoming terribly sophisticated. The great typewriter fiasco is a good example. It is the marvelous story of how the typewriter got the top row of its keyboard: QWERTYUIOP. It got these letters because the gentleman who invented the typewriter knew that his salesmen didn't know how to type. Therefore, he varied the letters in the word typewriter and put them all in the top row so that his salesmen could speedily type the name of their product. The fact that this makes you wind up with the "a" under the little finger and a few other minor handicaps is irrelevant--he had his sales demonstration built into the keyboard. Someone

came along later, however, and developed a functional typewriter keyboard. They put it into the schools and they had the John Hancock Insurance Company in Boston hire all these special typists. That meant that the typists, the school, and the Hancock Insurance Company were all locked together. The girls prepared on that keyboard couldn't get a job any other place, and no one else was buying the typewriters. So even though that typing keyboard was about 300 percent more efficient, the product never sold because it got locked in strange ways. As educators, I think that we need to keep people from getting locked in.

We need to eliminate the entire notion of jurisdictional balance that we all like so well. We really squabble when someone reduces an hourly requirement. A suggestion that we might reduce a three hour requirement in real vocational education can cause a furor. If you reduce it to two hours, that is pre-vocational. It seems to me it depends on the activity whether you need three hours a day or not. It has nothing to do with the definition of vocational and pre-vocational education. The resistance is understandable, however, because as vocational educators we had to fight hard to get blocks of time so we could do some serious vocational activities. That doesn't mean, however, that everything has to be taught in three hours or else it becomes pre-vocational. It means you need to have the time available in the curriculum to do the job that needs to be done.

I would end by saying I hope that if we approach the problem of putting together a curriculum on the secondary level, we would ask the main questions--curriculum questions that would indicate a real re-examination of the vocational courses, <u>per se</u>. My biases may not reflect the world the way it is. However, I have been seriously working with the problem. I don't consider vocational education something to be defensive about. I think it is something that needs to receive much more attention in the total education picture. However, I think that as long as everyone is fighting the status battles and counting hours, those two forces combined can produce more miseducation than anything else that we do.

# IMPLICATIONS OF THE VOCATIONAL AMENDMENTS OF 1968

by

Lowell Burkett

It is always a real pleasure for me to have an opportunity to talk with the State Directors of Vocational Education. I have a chance occasionally to see you at meetings and talk to you individually or over the phone. To have you together and have the opportunity to speak longer than three minutes provides me with an opportunity to discuss some things I think will be of tremendous interest to you. I did have the opportunity to speak to you last December at the American Vocational Association convention; at that time I told you that we were on the threshold of making some real strides in vocational education. I also met with you at your spring meeting and outlined for you some of the steps that have been taken in regard to the AVA legislative efforts. I am happy, of course, to report to you that we are moving along quite well with the legislative program. I anticipate that we will have an Act signed by the President between September 15 and October 1.

It was the last minute before Congress recessed for the conventions that they took action on a number of legislative measures affecting education. One was the Higher Education Act, which had to be amended and extended this year. The Vocational Education Acts do not have any part expiring this year except the work study program. It has been up to the legislation strategists in Washington to keep these two pieces of legislation moving as closely together as possible in order that vocational education legislation would be enacted before Congress adjourns. These two pieces of legislation are moving together at the present time; both passed the House and Senate and are waiting for the conference committees to resolve the differences in the House and Senate versions of the bills so that the Conference Reports can be approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President.

The Senate conferees have been appointed. Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon is the Chairman of the Education Sub-committee of the Senate. Senator Yarborough of Texas is the second ranking senator. The other committee members are: Senator Clark of Pennsylvania, Senator Randolph of West Virginia, Senator Williams of New Jersey, and Senator Nelson of Wisconsin, Senator Prouty of Vermont, Senator Javits of New York, Senator Dominick of Colorado and Senator Murphy of California. The House conferees have not been appointed. I should tell you that there is a strategy employed in appointing conferees. I do not propose to reveal the strategy because of the confidence placed in me by members of the Congress.

---

Lowell Burkett is Executive Director of the American Vocational Association.

I would like to give you a brief resumé of how we worked on this legislation so that you as leaders in the states might interpret the legislation in its present form. I am sure that all of you have followed the bills very closely that were introduced in 1966, 1967, and the bills that were introduced this year. It was the intent of the Education and Labor Committee of the House to hold extensive hearings, because they felt that the only way to get substantial support for vocational education and to obtain the inputs that were necessary for good legislation was to hear from many different people. Congress was fully aware of the need for extensive hearings because since the passage of the 1963 Act there were many individuals, organizations, and special interest groups in our economy and in our society that have become increasingly interested in vocational education and the contributions it can make. The pressures were on them to hear from everyone who was interested so that they might put together a piece of legislation that would be responsive to a great number of needs.

There have been a total of 25 days of hearings in the House. There was one volume of hearings in 1966, two volumes in 1967 and three volumes in 1968--a total of six volumes of hearings on vocational education. Congress has heard from many people, not only the people from vocational education, but representatives of business, industry, organized labor, and special interest groups. This legislation, therefore, is taking into consideration many points of view and various interests that we have in our economy and in our society, so that it will be more responsive to the total needs of the people. If I was drafting the legislation for you, or if you were drafting it, you would probably draft it differently. There was more input into this legislation than we ever had in any piece of vocational education legislation. We have in this legislation more points of view expressed, more interest and more concern than ever before. I think this is good; this is the only way that vocational education will ever be responsive to the needs of people. The involvement of people in formulation of the legislation gives them an interest in its implementation.

I have been very close to the Congress all the way along in its attempt to effect this new legislation. There has been a great amount of input from vocational educators. We have worked with many groups outside of education who have attempted to do things that were not good for vocational education. In many cases we have had the opportunity to influence them by helping them to understand the function of vocational education.

I think one of the most difficult and time consuming of all the things we do in the AVA office is work with groups that are interested in seeking the benefits of vocational education, but do not know what it is about, how it is organized, how it is administered, and what it is supposed to do. We spend many, many hours working with these groups. We cannot do all we would like to have done with some of them because they have their own specialized interests. You can understand that, as we have our own interests.

All legislation is a compromise; there was compromise on our part as well as on the part of other groups. There had to be, because we were far apart on some of our points of view. However, the AVA has the confidence of the leadership in the House and the Senate. The House asked us to assist them draft HR-16460. We had our inputs of that time since we utilized the services of our legal counsel in the actual drafting. Each individual Congressman seemed to have a specialized interest in certain aspects of the legislation and these were included in the original draft. There were 53 members of the House that signed their names to the legislation when it was reported out by the Education and Labor Committee of the House.

With this new legislation we are close to some real breakthroughs in vocational education. Undoubtedly we will have to take on new and added responsibilities. I think we are going to have a greater responsibility than we have ever had before. One member of this State Director's group told me: "I am scared to face the years ahead, as I see the needs expressed in this legislation." I hope most of you are not, because you have a great opportunity for really putting vocational education into the foreground.

There will be things that perhaps we will not like in the legislation. If so, we can correct anything that happens to be wrong with the legislation by seeking amendments. An act "on the books" is the first step. The next step is getting the guidelines prepared in order to implement this act. Congress cannot write all the intent into the working of the act. The intent is revealed by the hearings and the reports on the bills. I hope that we will have the opportunity, and I am sure we will, to work with the federal officials in helping interpret the intent of Congress and to work out the kinds of guidelines that will be workable as far as the administration of the program is concerned. I have talked with the United States Commissioner of Education about this. He assured me, along with a number of interested business leaders in the Nation, that we will have the opportunity to make inputs into the guidelines for the administration of the vocational education act.

I thought it would be helpful today for me to try to interpret to you what I think the Congress is saying to us as vocational educators. I believe Congress, which really represents the people, is saying that we have a very serious social problem in this country and vocational education can assist. I do not think they are saying we can solve the total problem, but we can assist in dealing with some of these social problems. This has been the concern of the Congress during this session; it has been foremost in their minds.

The Congress is also saying that we have a serious manpower problem due to a change in technology and the economic growth of our country. The Congress is also saying that there is a great deficiency in our total education system and that it must be corrected in some way or another. They say that this deficiency has left great vacuums and that these are being filled and will continue to be filled by agencies outside of the public education systems unless the public education system is responsive to the needs of people.

Congress is saying that it does not feel that some of the programs conducted outside the educational system are efficient. Some are overlapping our efforts and some are a duplication of our effort, and this is at great public expense. Congress hopes that these programs can be coordinated so that the Nation has a better system of preparing manpower. It is saying that vocational-technical education, as a part of the total education program, has the potential for the job of manpower training. It is saying that it wants to give vocational education a chance. It is saying that vocational education, in the past, has been shortchanged in terms of resources and support. It is saying it likes some of the things that it has seen about vocational education and it dislikes some other things it has seen. Therefore, Congress has said that this legislation must provide more resources to expand and improve what is already being done in vocational education and direct it into new areas of endeavor. Congress is saying that this legislation should provide more visibility for the program at the National and at the State levels. Congress feels that the Advisory Council concept that is written into this act will provide additional visibility and support for the program. This act will provide for total planning involving every segment of our economy and our society. It will broaden vocational education's responsibilities to include not only training people for direct entry into jobs but also provide remedial education as a part of the vocational education process. This act will provide for vocational guidance that is realistic in helping people to make occupational choices.

The Congress is saying that this act should focus on serving the disadvantaged because they are not currently being served by any educational program. It is saying that vocational-technical education should expand and improve the post-secondary level. It is saying that vocational education should team up with business and industry and develop the cooperative part-time vocational education program. It is saying that vocational education must work more closely with business, industry and everyone who is involved in the vocational education process or who is the user of the vocational education product. It is saying that teacher education is a critical problem--we do not have enough people being trained as teachers and we need better trained teachers.

Congress is saying that curriculum development needs to be expanded. It is saying that evaluation must be built into our programs and that we must be more sensitive to the evaluative process. It is saying that research must be relevant and it must be expanded greatly and utilized more. All these things that they are saying are built into this legislation to help alleviate a national problem.

I have tried to think what will be the implications after this Act is enacted--to think of it as far as the AVA office is concerned. When I think of the AVA office I am thinking of all the vocational educators throughout the nation. A few years ago when we went before the Appropriations Committee to plead our cause for funds for vocational education we kept saying, "We need more money, we need more money". We appealed to the Appropriations Committee on an emotional basis. "We need more money" was true when we were getting $50 million or $100 million. This same emotional appeal cannot be utilized when we

have legislation that is going to amount to 3/4 of a billion dollars or perhaps a billion dollars. The time has arrived when we have to justify every dollar that we ask for as far as the Congress is concerned. I have no doubt that the need is there, but we must know what that need is, we must know who the people are to be served, how many people need to be served, what resources are needed, what we are currently doing--much information of this type.

I will not be able next year or the year following to go before the Congress and say we need $500 million just because we think we need it. This is going to mean that our reporting systems in the states and at the national level must provide this information. I hope that steps are being taken in each of your states so that you can begin to feed this information into the Office of Education, or to us, because we cannot use information two years old. We must have it for the year it is needed. Therefore, our system of collecting and reporting data has to improve. You will have to work with all the agencies charged with this responsibility: The Center here at Ohio State, The U. S. Office of Education, with your people collectively and individually to obtain the kinds of information needed in order to get Federal funds.

One of the big problems I am sure we will face in the future is the attempt of certain groups to wrest from us the responsibility for vocational education. It has become so important to our economy and our society that we are going to have to work harder at the job of interpreting the role of vocational education as part of the total education program.

I tried to keep a tally on the number of groups that we worked with last year and found that 231 groups came to us either on an initial contact or on a follow-up. Some of these have followed up as many as four or five times. I am sure that as our program grows this responsibility will be heavier on the AVA staff.

I have been trying to determine what we must do in regard to strengthening our professional organization. I am sure we are going to have to strain our efforts at the federal, state and local levels; no one segment of the profession can be. We are going to have to be strong at the state level, strong at the national level, and strong at the local level.

I am greatly concerned about the visibility for and leadership of vocational education in the U. S. Office. The problem is not with the few dedicated vocational educators that are in the U. S. Office of Education, but with the people at the policy making level who demonstrate little or no concern for vocational education. All you need to do is look at the bill that was introduced by the U. S. Office of Education and see how much commitment they have. There are fewer people in the Office of Education today to administer the vocational education program than there was in 1963. There seems to be very little effort on the part of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the people responsible for the budget to obtain help for the dedicated vocational educators in the U. S. Office of Education. This is very unfortunate. The Congress of the United States recognizes this problem too.

I have extracted from the hearings some questions raised by the Members of Congress and the answers that were given. I have also extracted from the Congressional Record some things that were said that relate to this particular point. I would like to mention some statements that were made in House reports on the new legislation. This is what the full committee on Education and Labor said about the establishment of a Bureau of Vocational Education:

> The committee decided not to mandate the creation of a separate Bureau of Vocational Education within the Office of Education, in light of the testimony before the committee, that the members of the Office of Education expected to place greater emphasis on vocational education within the bureaucratic structure of the Office of Education, by expanding the staff and giving greater status to the Bureau administering the program.

There was also a statement in the House Report on the bill that was made by the minority party which dealt with the same subject. They said:

> The status of vocational education within the U. S. Office has been consistently downgraded in numerous reorganizations in recent years so that it is only a division of a bureau within that office. The administrative budget for that division is less than one-half that of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, $1.5 million short of that of the Bureau of Higher Education, and only a little more than half the amount spent within the Office for Executive Direction and Administration. Yet it is this small staff, this single small division to which we must look for national leadership in this vital work.

What I am saying is that there is a great concern being expressed by Members of Congress. We should pursue this matter vigorously with the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

There is a similar statement in the Senate Report on the bill which says, in essence, that the Act of 1963 directed the appointment in 1966, and each five years thereafter, of an Advisory Council in Vocational Education to evaluate administration of the Act and its impact. The first such council of 1967 reported that it found its assessment seriously hampered by the lack of data. Not only was the regular reporting system grossly inadequate, but the Office of Education had made no advance preparation to produce special data for the Council.

I am delighted, however, with the things that I hear about the organization, about the staffing, the morale and upgrading of the professional staff within the States. I think this is very commendable and a great credit to the leadership you are giving. I am also very heartened with the leadership at the local level.

I do think we have a serious problem in getting the kinds of leadership at the National level that will coordinate the efforts of the states, and that will provide to the policy makers at the national level the information needed. There must be a commitment to do the job that has to be done in this country. I am quite confident that without the AVA and the work that is being done by you people, we would not have the promise of this new legislation.

We have all had to work hard the last two or three years to accomplish this legislation. It is a great tribute to you people and the local people who have conducted the program, because the Members of Congress coming back from the local communities and from the states know what vocational education can do. The credit does not lie with me; it lies with you people who have developed the program. My only hope is that we will continue to move ahead to meet the challenge of the future. I think we are on the threshold of something great in vocational education. We are at a point where our program can move very rapidly if we will accept the challenge given to us.

Thank you!

# TOTAL TRAINING RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Leon Minear

I welcome the opportunity to talk to you about some problems. The first one concerns interpreting vocational education to the public. The Advertising Council and the National Industrial Conference Board, together with the Division of Vocational Technical Education of the U. S. Office of Education, are planning to mount a massive public information program by television, magazine, and newspaper in February, 1969. These agencies will collectively sponsor an intensive campaign for two years, in which we will appeal to the various media and to the general public to urge young people to get a technical education. The people paying for the program, i.e., the Advertising Council and the NICB, want to stress technical education, rather than vocational education in general. Therefore, the advertisement is going to say something like this: "If you want to know more about how you can get a technical education, write to the U. S. Office of Education for a booklet." This booklet is being printed and in the back of it is a tear-out postcard with the name and address of the State Director of vocational education. If effect, this postcard says, "Write to your State Director of vocational education for more information about where in your State you can get the kind of technical training in which you have some interest."

I asked the Advertising Council how many inquiries they thought our Office would receive. They estimated we would get from 250,000 to two and one-half million inquiries. They believe that about half that number will be returned to the local State Directors.

I am worried about the impact that the receipt of a million and a quarter postcards will have on your State Boards for Vocational Education. Suppose that after a particular campaign in your local television stations and your local newspaper, your state receives 5,000 cards on which the youngsters say, "I'm interested in these kinds of occupations. Where do I get the training?" We had originally intended to compile the necessary information in a booklet that you could send to these youngsters. A survey revealed, however, that a listing of all the job training programs in the country would mean publishing an encyclopedia. Financially we could not do this. You, therefore, need to give some thought to what you will do if you receive from five to fifty thousand postcards asking you for information about job training opportunities in your State. This is going to be a headache, but it is an important and a delightful headache. We are going to try and create more demands

---

Leon Minear is Director of the Division of Vocational-Technical Education in the U. S. Office of Education.

and more interest in technical education, so that some of the legislative programs that we have been working on will pay off with more and better trained consumers.

The second thing I want to talk about is youth organizations. The problem that is currently being discussed is where are we going in our relationships with the youth organizations? The State Directors have a committee that is trying to resolve some of the problems that have come about concerning the youth organizations in vocational-technical education. I would like to bring you up-to-date on their work. Through the very excellent offices of Lowell Burkett of the AVA, and others, we have in the legislation, a statement that vocational education, with its legal interpretation, shall include work with youth organizations. We have admonitions calling on the Office to give leadership in the development of these youth organizations in a number of statements in the Senate and House reports of the hearings on these two bills. We have an Office wide committee, representing science clubs and other clubs, working with the vocational educators to try and determine uniform Office-wide policy for these organizations. This committees' policies usually proceed to the executive group of the Commissioner's which consists of many people who are not educators; they are data-processors, accountants, and attorneys. I feel, however, that this is an educational problem. Therefore, I have prevailed on the Commissioner not to present some policies to that group for their discussion but rather to the group in the Office that had more appropriate backgrounds as vocational educators. We are holding that report deliberately, because we want to wait and see if the bill gets passed.

Some of you are quite concerned about precipitous actions with these youth organizations. I can assure there will be none; we have had them for many years. We are quite concerned about doing a good job with youth organizations. Any moves that the Office makes will be based on sound logic and only after prior consultations with the committee which you Directors have appointed. If the legislation is passed, and the statement goes into law defining vocational education in such a manner that it includes youth organizations, then we will ask for our committee report. At that time I hope to get a group together with your committee to talk about the problems that we see. The main problem is that we have one youth organization written into the law and it has great fiscal support from the Office; the other organizations are not written into law and receive no money from the office. Some are very close to us while others are far away.

We have a program in mind for the youth organizations, but I don't think the State Directors should be unduly concerned. This is our plan. First, do nothing until legislation is passed and the youth organizations are defined as an integral part of vocational education. Our second step is to call for and receive the committee's recommendations. Our last step is to get together with the planning committee and discuss the problems we see. The main problem we see is the lack of uniform treatment of the various organizations. There are no objections to people in the Office being consultants or advisors to the youth organizations.

There are certainly objections to professional staff of the Office dominating and running them. We feel there is no place in the system of American education for the kinds of domination that could come of some of these youth groups from the Federal Office. We strongly believe that we should be in the role of coordinator and consultant; however, the State Directors and the local directors should be primarily responsible for the youth organizations.

The third thing I wanted to talk to you about is the organization within the Division of Vocational-Technical Education. After many discussions with people, we have embarked on a reorganization of the thirty-eight professional positions we have in the Division. As I try to determine how I can carry out my responsibility with the kinds of people and the organizations with whom I must relate, I realize it is not easy. We have five or six commonwealths, territories, and possessions in addition to the fifty State departments of education. We also have nine regional offices that have never been developed to the extent of our original intention. Instead of having for you in the regional office the expertise which we said would be there, we've ended up instead with several positions representing the Bureau, and they represent wide areas of adult education and library service as well as vocational-technical education and manpower development and training. We don't have a strong, large organization that can quickly react to the problems of each State. How, then, can we effect action in vocational-technical education with what we have?

I'm going to recommend to you two documents--the Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate and the Report of the House Committee Deliberations on Education. These represent the views of the Congressional committees, along with specific comments on the bill and tabulations of facts and backup data. There are a number of things in these reports that are very interesting; one is that there is some severe criticism of vocational education. Congress has not asked for more of the same thing. It has asked, instead, for an accelerated program and a broadening of the base in vocational education. I do not think that Congress asks the Commissioner or me to tell you what these directions should be. Education is a function of the State. The State Directors have this as their primary responsibility; our role is to back you. I recommend you write your Congressman and ask for the Reports of the House and of the Senate Committees, as well as copies of the two bills. After the Conference Committee has met there will be a report of that group.

In order to understand the bills, in order to understand the final legislation, the attitude, the defining, the arguing, the debates behind it, you really need to read these. I'm going to read one or two little sections, because I have the feeling that this sets the stage for a shift in direction. Page eight, last paragraph of the Senate report reads:

> Since the Commissioner of Education has the authority to approve the State plans and projected activities which are prerequisite to receiving Federal funds, he also has the authority to disapprove them.

In our meetings with your State Directors we agreed that the last thing we want to do is disapprove your State plans or projected activity statements. If we disapprove of your directions, then obviously we can't work together to have a program in your State. Therefore, we are not going to arbitrarily approve of them. Nevertheless, the report is saying that we not only have that authority, but we have the obligation with the authority that goes with it. It goes on:

> No State plan with its accompanying projected activities has been disapproved, and there is little evidence that they are seriously studied by the Office of Education.

I do not think that is true. I think they are studied very carefully both at the regional offices and in our Office. All of your State plans have recently been gathered into one document and printed. The Senators who wrote this particular report criticized us because we have not rejected some poor State plans, but instead have been trying to work with you to develop programs. The report continues:

> It is required that the information results and experience derived from the conduct of research model education programs and State emphasis programs be effectively used in the State plan programs.

I interpret this statement this way. It is required that the information, results, and experiences derived from the conducted research be included in your State plans or projected list of activities. This means that some of the tremendous work you heard about this morning has to be taken into consideration in developing programs, or your State plans cannot be approved. It says that an annual evaluation report must be submitted to the Commissioner. Subsection B of Section 123 of the Senate bill requires the Commissioner to make a specific set of findings as to the compliance of the State plan with the requirements of the law. Such findings must be submitted to the appropriate committee of Congress at least annually.

Why am I reading this to you? I think Congress has said to our Office that we are guilty of not having pursued vigorously the development of improved programs of vocational education. It has said we must see to it that your State plans take into consideration new ideas that come out, thereby insuring that so much valuable research does not go to waste. It doesn't say that you have to do everything that some of the research proponents have considered requisite. However, you should at least have a mechanism for screening them. The report also says that we have not yet turned down a State plan if we thought it meant business. This does mean that we are going to have to see that you have a mechanism in your State plans for updating vocational education through the local districts. You must have an effective mechanism since a report has to be made to the Commissioner and Congress on the status of this at least annually. In another section, Congress has said it expects to have an on-going committee to keep an eye on vocational education to see that we comply. I don't think Congress has ever said that to the Division

or the State Directors before. We are going to have to figure this out together. I want the most flexibility we can have in your hands, because the State Directors have this as their fundamental responsibility.

I want to mention a few things about my fifth topic, which is legislation. New legislation is still in two bills--a House bill and a Senate bill; the Conference Committee has to get together and agree upon some compromise measure. Both our Office and the AVA have recommended that the Senate bill be the basic bill. The money is apportioned this way; seventy percent for State special interests, ten percent for innovative efforts of the Office, and for on-going programs, and ten percent for research. I want to talk to you a little bit about research. I think that vocational educators had better start looking at research. I have the feeling that vocational educators as a group have not been trained to be close to the kinds of research we are getting. Therefore, to put it mildly, we have not been giving it the best of our support.

Congress reflects our attitudes very strongly. Therefore, if we spite Congress and make negative remarks about the research program, as far as Congress is concerned, we can write off that aspect of the program. Where would we be in our new directions if we do not support this research? I've heard from my staff, "Well I don't like this kind of research," and "We'd rather have the money come over here." We've got to keep that to ourselves! Vocational education has to stand together. If we don't, we'll be falling apart. To lose our vocational research budget would be disastrous. We presently have research funds going into this Center and the Research Coordinating Units. There are various programs funded from time to time from the Office and there is talk of putting curriculum research funds into Rutgers University. We have to find a way to use the results of that research. We have to find a way to make it meaningful. My most important point, however, is that if we don't back the component parts of this new piece of legislation, we may lose the whole thing.

We're asking that the seven accepted amendments from the House have certain titles: e.g. the Cooperative Education title, the Work-Study title, the Residential Schools title, and the Curriculum title. If you add all the money and divide it in half between the Senate and House, you come out with some kind of a program similar to that. Here is the reason we are asking for that. If Congress gives you ten percent of the gross amount for the State special emphasis program, and then says in the definition that this must be used for curriculum, work-study, cooperative education, you really do not have ten percent special state emphasis. With the popularity that the work-study program is enjoying these days you just would not be able to put money into innovation or some special state emphasis program. You would be putting most of the money into the work-study program. Our proposal is to take these four titles out of the state special emphasis program and use the titles from the House bill. We would then add them on to the Senate bill. There are other changes that we have heard about, and they are very good ones. These are the four that we thought we should be pushing.

We have already been asked about legislation for next year. A year hence you may be hearing about a bill that is either general guidance or vocational guidance. I think one of the major problems we have to solve is the best way to inform students about vocational education. After you develop the finest program in the country, how do you get through that counselor barrier? Counselors don't mean to be a barrier, but they often are not knowledgeable about the world of work or about vocational education in preparation for this. We hope to bring together some aspects of vocational education and guidance that really aren't too far apart in some communities, but are miles apart in others. We want to be certain that the employment service and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation help students. We need to get closer to all of these community elements; we need to bring them together to help boys and girls. We will be better off if we can encourage vocational counseling. Not every bit is unrealistic, but too much of it is.

We have interested the Ford Foundation and others in meetings to talk about our new legislation. We have a desperate need to determine what the Division of Vocational Education force means to the Office of Education and what it has to do with this new legislation. Many people in Congress have taken a look at the new kinds of bills and said that perhaps we should turn this all back to the states. Many of you at the same time were saying to us: "Why don't you give some leadership?" We have a fascinating historical origin in vocational education. It's one place where the American people, the consumers, and the vocational educators, really want more help than the federal government is currently capable of giving them.

This next year we're going to have the Office trembling. It is a tough job because we are determined to develop guidelines and new regulations that are simple to follow and use. I am hoping that when you see the regulations you will remember the awful reports you have to compile and you will help me make them compact, so that we only get the facts that are necessary. This will eliminate the terrible annual job of assembling all those reports. Some of those reports are very important however; I'm not undermining those. Let us keep in mind the amount of work you have to go through in your offices and the local offices to get those reports done.

We are determined to work with you. I may have to ask you to go to your State Superintendent and request him to meet with us regionally or nationally. Either way, we have to spend more time together this year.

From time to time we have written you and asked you to put us on to any new young blood in vocational education. Do you have some local directors who might come into the Office for a few years and get some experience? We are going to need some new young people in the Office in the fourth branch I told you about in June--some people with innovative ideas, but people who still have their feet on the ground, who have taught vocational education and, hopefully, have administered it. I'd like to ask you to keep in mind that in the next four to five months we are going to be needing a dozen young people to come and fill the jobs we are hoping to get. I would love to find a half a dozen or a

dozen good young people to help us develop our new programs. Then when they have had a few good years on the Washington scene, you could hire them back from us, having gained a broader perspective. We have some capable men in the Office who have experience and have been in the Office many, many years, but that isn't youth--not because youth is infallible, but because youth has ambition and energy. We have a number of men who have been around long enough to tell them what to do; in new programs, however, we are going to need ambition and energy. I urge you, if you know of new, young local directors who might enjoy a shift of scenery, request that they fill our Federal Form 57 and send it to us.

I have been talking about and working with what I think are the components of a tremendous enterprise. There was a time when the Division of Vocational-Technical Education was many times larger than it is now. We once had approximately 200 professional staff working in it; today we have 38. There was a time when we had most of the money; we were the tail that wagged the Office of Education dog. We had funding before the U. S. Office had funding, but that time is no more. Sometime ago it was decided, and I think rightly so, that all knowledge and widsom do not necessarily emanate from Washington. There are fifty aggressive, intelligent State Directors around with a lot of knowledge and wisdom. We have gone through fifty one years of historical vocational education in which we have been developing strong local leadership; we ought to recognize this with the kind of Federal establishment we had. It was decided, however, that instead of funding a bigger Federal Office, we ought to view some of the things we have accomplished. Therefore, they took some of the programs that the DVTE had and put some of them over in parts of the Office. Some people argue about that, but I think it is a good thing. They also took some of the money we had and put it into another Division, DCVR, that goes equal with DVTE. They left a pure, simple, unadulterated task to me: to try and give professional leadership to the secondary programs, post-secondary and adult programs in America. I can't do it, but we can. We can try and get the research units and the practitioners in vocational education a little closer together in an on-going program.

When I consider the magnitude of the task that lies ahead, what with greatly increased authorizations for appropriation, widely expanded program authority as provided in the Amendments of 1968, as well as the rapidly changing needs of our society for training and retraining, I can only say to you that ours must be a cooperative venture in leadership and program administration if we are to meet the goals and expectations of the Congress when it addressed itself to the nations needs for vocational-technical education.

# PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT OF STAFF

by

Cloyd Steinmetz

It would be presumptuous of me to talk about the specifics of what vocational educators should put into professional development and staff programs. You are the experts in that to start with and, although I have about 35 years in that same field myself, I don't presume to tell you what it should be. However, I would like to discuss what is in my province--that is why and how and who is responsible for professional staff development.

I think the word "professional" in professional improvement gives us the name of the street on which we're to travel. We need to know what is in professional improvement and professional development. I think the professionals of the profession ought to start to develop in themselves some of the simple things that make for effective results. The catch, however, is in the problems that you have in vocational education today, as far as professionalism is concerned. The catch is that you are thinking at the most either unilaterally or two dimensionally; the solution to the problem, however, is three dimensional. The third dimension is attitude, and I think our attitude stinks. I think that is the big problem that we face in professional development.

I was at a meeting recently, and the man who introduced the main speaker said, "This man is a man who has gone the second mile". He put it this way--he said the first mile men must work; in the second, they work to maintain their sense of dignity and worth. In the first mile, men seek subsistence and tangible rewards; in the second they strive for durable satisfactions in life. That's what is wrong with professional development--the people who should be seeking the second mile are not.

Let me illustrate my point. I had a man who had been with our company 21 years, and had been shuttled from one place to another. He got to my place without desire on his part or mine. I told him, "Look, this is a simple job. You either cut the buck, or you and I are going to have a talk and that will be it. I know you are a capable person." He didn't improve, even though he was given a lot of extra opportunities for improvement. Therefore, because no one else would have him, I had the pleasure of getting rid of him. I called him in and told him to report to personnel, who gave him the final walking papers. He came to me and said, "Steinmetz, I can't understand it. Twenty-one years experience with Reynolds and now what am I going to do? Where am I going to start over again?" I said, "If you have 21 years of experience with Reynolds

---

Cloyd Steinmetz is Director of Sales Training (Retired) at Reynolds Metal Company.

you have a tremendous starting block, but you don't have 21 years of experience with Reynolds." He said, "I don't?" I said, "You have just had six months of experience with Reynolds, 44 times, and that's as far as you have gone. What are you going to do to start looking after yourself?" Do you know what he did? He went out and in the first year he sold $180,000 worth of real estate. He made more than he ever made in the Reynolds Company or ever would have made. I am saying simply this--that if we go the second mile we've got to be in it with our hearts and our minds, and we can't just say I made a decision and now I am going to live by it. We are all subject to making mistakes.

You asked me where you could go in industry to pick up some good men for your staffs. I think you ought to go to your staffs and start developing there. Don't do it on the basis that they have so many more credit hours, however. More credit hours do not necessarily make someone more competent; they may even be more incompetent after those additional credit hours. Since I am speaking to experts in education that know that all development is self-development, I'm sure that I'm speaking to a group who also knows that all motivation is not self-motivation. The thing that I'm concerned about is this matter that you and I cannot implement another person's desire to be something other than what he is. It can be done, however, by giving the person a clear-cut image of himself. We have two wonderful devices, the tape recorder, now so easy to use, and a wonderful thing called the video-tape recorder from which you can get almost instantaneous self-images. An individual who listens to a tape recorder or looks at a video-tape recorder doesn't always come up with an admirable image of himself. He says I don't like what I see; then he does something about it. If you want to make a tremendous change in your staff I'd suggest you buy a video tape recorder. Set it up as a policy that every teacher and every staff member must record one hour of video tape three times during the year. Then they must sit down and spend three more hours looking at themselves. You will get professional development like you have never seen before. The first fifteen minutes are an admiration society, but after that they get disgusted. They don't like to see people scratching their heads and they don't like the way in which they speak. They don't like the language they use and the expressions that were evidently going out to other people, so they do something about it. The self-image then changes. In providing this atmosphere where they have the opportunity to see themselves as they really are, you don't motivate them; you create an environment in which self-motivation can take place.

Too many of us are working on the basis of the cuniform tablet. The cuniform tablet was a business record that was made about 2,100 years before Christ. It was a wonderful record and a tremendous achievement then. However, in terms of today's society it is a grossly inefficient way to record. We should take a look at it, however. Past training attitudes and efforts share a similar fate to the cuniform tablet. When one visits the places that you and I visit, we find we're still hanging on the cuniform tablets to a great extent.

I'd like to mention a few things that are going to hurt. As an outsider to your business, in a sense, and from a consumer's viewpoint of you and the school product, namely student graduates or pupils, I read these words: selling, typing, English, common courtesy, discourtesy, and cleanliness. You walk into the average store and what kind of treatment do you get? I can consistently find people who can look right straight through me and never see me. This is the part of the basic attitudes not of that person, but of the employees' supervisors. If the supervisors see that happen once and don't do something about it, it will happen again. But if the supervisor sees it happen once and does something about it, it won't happen again. Of course you don't want turnover; its hard to get these people. You'd be better off with the turnover, however, and you'd be better off without people, rather than offer the kind of treatment some people are getting in retail stores today, and elsewhere too. The same thing is true about salesmanship. People aren't trying to communicate effectively, and that's all salesmanship is.

For tardiness and clock watching, I'll pick on my own company. The time that we report to work is 8:30 in the morning; if you come in about 8:35 you want to be careful because a lot of the late comers are really speeding up. They figure if they don't get in by 8:45 they will get in trouble. At 8:35 they are still under the wire, so we have the mad rush. At 4:58, however, don't try to get out of our building, because you are going to be walked over, pushed, and shoved by some of the finest, most beautiful, most voluptuous mini-skirted clad youths of America. They figure that if they can just be inside the door until that bell rings, they'll be outside at five and one second. Where did this attitude come from? We didn't teach it, but we unfortunately didn't prevent it.

In these days of political accent we're hearing about needs of the great society. John W. Gardner, a man I greatly admire, reminds us that social renewal depends ultimately on individuals, and that the individual today has his problems. I don't think we will ever solve any of our social woes unless the individual has his problems solved.

Let's take a look at this specific problem that you have: how to develop staff professionalism. To quote William James, "Most of us are more and more enslaved to the stock conception with which we have once become familiar, and less and less capable of assimilating impressions in any but old ways. Old fogyism is in short the inevitable terminus to which life swipes on. Genius, in truth, means little more than the faculty to proceed in an unhabitual way." I certainly think he said a mouthful. Gardner goes on to say that as we mature we progressively narrow the scope and the variety of our lives. Of all the interests we might pursue, we settle on a few. Of all the people with whom we might associate, we select a small number. We become caught in a web of fixed relationships. We develop set ways of doing things.

I am going to ask you a practical question as a supervisor of people, just as I have within the industry. With whom do you associate most? In your percentage of distribution of your associations, you

should associate with the leaders of your community, with the leaders in your profession and, on a personal basis, with the people you have working for you. But how many of the people that work for and with you have you seen in their home environment? Have you met their wives and families, because when all is said and done, that is why they are working. I have tested a "Know the Man Plan" in industry. I have asked men to think of a person they supervise and know best. What is his full name? What is his wife's name? How many children does he have? What are their names? What is this man affiliated with other than business? Where does he live? There are only three more questions that we ask; I'm not going to ask them, because unless I am in a superior group, you have already dropped out on answering many or all of those questions--the simple questions that mean so much to the man in terms of his self-motivation. How can a man develop himself with a nagging wife or a sick child? If you don't know that handicap exists, you may send him away to college, give him a sabbatical, let him take a summer course, and think that is going to cure your professional ills.

They say there are four kinds of workers. First there are the "I just work here" kind. They are seeking security, steady income, and personal satisfaction. The second group is the organization men. They find their employment natural fields to exercise personal power. They maneuver, they plot, they scheme for advancement and status, but all of it is done without rocking the boat, and it is done solely for their benefit. The third group is the cosmopolitans. They see the employer as the environment in which their own professional advancement and attainment can be procured and their professional goals can be established. Their goals are quite apart from the goals of the position. The fourth group is the changemaker group. They are the innovators who strive to see the results of their work in the changing nature of the organization's view toward such things as racial integration, diversification, and social responsibility. They tend to keep the organization loose, flexible and changing. We don't have enough in this group. Are you and/or your staff members of the changemaker group? Ask yourself these two questions. 1. What have I done differently lately? 2. How really differently have I done things? We must always have even higher expectancies of ourselves.

There are five ingredients to success, according to John Wilson, former Vice-President of NCR. They are honesty, health, knowledge of the business, enthusiasm, and self-motivation. A man may possess the first four of these qualifications, but he must be actuated by a desire to succeed. We must have a motivation that is sufficiently strong to overcome the aversion to doing things that we do not like to do, but which are necessary to succeed. Do we point this out in vocational education, i.e., you have to do some things that you don't like to do in order to ultimately do things that you want to do?

Confucious said "Many men are as wise as I am, but few are as fond of learning." Some of them just subject themselves to the misery of learning in order to fill out the qualification sheet. Theodore Roosevelt said that every man owes some of his time to the upbuilding of the profession to which he belongs. Robert Kennedy said, "I dream things that never were, and say why not." Why can't we get our people thinking along these lines? Why don't we tell academic people that personnel runs the

same risk of obsolescence that machines do? Many times people say, "Just sit back and look at what you did, and then you'll know what you did right or wrong." A few people have unique minds where they can picture what was said, and they can picture someone else saying something exactly the way they said it. Most people cannot, however.

Dr. Shearer put it this way. Too many self-styled professionals have not taken the time or trouble to become acquainted with the fundamental challenges inherent in their jobs. They know the how, but they don't know the why. I think that the professionals who submit themselves to a set of disciplines to become more professional have to become more strict disciplinarians of themselves as well as their subject specialty.

In summary, I think we're faced with the problem of indifference to greatness. I have hinted at attacking the problem by using the audio recorder and the video tape recorder and urging people to utilize their library, but more especially for bosses to get better acquainted with their staffs. Only then you can get professionalization; there will be a development of a new species of which you can be exceedingly proud.

# NEW AND EMERGING PHILOSOPHIES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by

Dr. John P. Walsh

The basis of philosophy--our own beliefs and understandings--is constantly being subjected to the pressures of the changing times. Periodically, we must ask ourselves, "What is it that we believe about vocational education?" No one can answer that question for us, nor can a group supply a patent answer. Whenever we speak of philosophy, we think of it in terms of our own individual feelings--feelings that reflect our beliefs and understandings based upon our own experiences in uncovering facts pertinent to vocational education.

A sound philosophy is necessary to establish a point of departure whenever we venture into new fields, new technologies, and new concepts. Therefore it behooves us to be continually aware of the need to build a philosophy consonant with the times, responsive to social syndromes, and in keeping with the pressures of the future.

What is your philosophy? What do you believe about vocational education? How do you bring into focus the past, the present, and the future in your philosophy of vocational education?

There are those among us who would say that a new philosophy must be developed whenever change occurs; there are others who would say that once a sound philosophy has been developed, it will long endure. Who is to say which one is correct? Perhaps there is a middle ground where we can hold a sound, basic philosophy and still make those changes necessary to keep pace with the times.

How does a philosophy of vocational education evolve? What are the undergirdings of this philosophy? A review of definitions of vocational education, over the years, surfaces this evolution. My own review of the literature uncovered the following examples.

A simple statement in a 1920 issue of The Vocational Summary, a publication of the old Federal Board for Vocational Education was quite revealing. The statement went like this:

---

John P. Walsh is President of the Dunwoody Industrial Institute.

"To make a good living; to have a happy family; to make preparation for hard times; to wear overalls in the shop with the same dignity as good clothes are worn on Sunday; to be confident you are laying a sure foundation for any future success; to feel that you are master of your work; and that you share the creative spirit; this is the wholesome philosophy of learning a trade."[1]

That was a statement of philosophy at that point in time in keeping with the times, and it made some sense.

As we continue to dig into our background of vocational education, we find that once before there was a panel of consultants, they didn't call themselves that back in 1938, then it was the Advisory Committee on Education and in their staff study they, too, made a statement of philosophy of vocational education--one that begins to draw closer to the feelings that we have in our own times. It was stated this way:

"Vocational education is a very inclusive term and, viewed broadly may cover all those experiences whereby an individual learns to carry on successfully any useful occupation. These experiences may be organized and institutionalized or unorganized and more or less haphazard. In a narrow sense, vocational education may be defined as a series of controlled and organized experiences arranged to prepare a person for a socially useful employment."[2]

The 1938 group took a philosophical position that would be difficult to challenge in our own times:

"Every citizen in a modern democracy should be equipped to contribute effectively to the welfare of the group. Only when each individual produces the maximum of which he is personally capable can the highest possible welfare of the group be achieved. Under any circumstances the number of citizens who will have sufficient resources to support themselves without engaging in productive work will be small . . . from a social as well as a realistic point of view, it is necessary to equip every young person for some occupation so that he may contribute effectively to the satisfaction of human wants. Improvement in the educational equipment of the individual so that he may make a greater contribution than he otherwise could to the productive needs of society should result, in the long run, in the improvement in the general welfare of the other group."[3]

---

[1] Milton P. Higgins, in the Wisconsin Apprentice. Taken from The Vocational Summary, Published by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, April 1920.

[2] John Dale Russel and Associates, Vocational Education. The Advisory Committee on Education. Staff Study No. 8. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938) p. 13.

[3] Ibid. pp. 175-176.

In brief, they were saying, "One has to make a living to make a life."

In the 1950's, after long discussion and consultation, the American Vocational Association developed its own definition and established a basis of philosophy.

> "Vocational education is designed to develop skills, abilities, understandings, attitudes, work habits, and appreciations encompassing knowledge and information needed by workers to enter and make progress in employment on a useful and productive basis. It is an integral part of the total educational program and contributes toward the development of good citizens by developing their physical, social, civic, cultural, and economic competencies."[4]

Match that statement with the pressures of today. Does it make sense? Does it hold water?

We could go on and on, moving up through the years and reviewing the statements of the day. Each time we will find that there are some modifiers showing up in the statements, each tending to draw a little closer to the times till we come to today when we have a great deal of social unrest and a great concern for vocational education. Again people begin to review their philosophies and concepts.

So these definitions are some beginnings for us and I am sure that each and every one of you has some kind of a similar personal statement of philosophy that guides you in your leadership role. But I wonder just what it is anchored in. Where does it come from? How did it generate?

Tom Quigley, that fine southern gentleman of vocational education, in writing his book, In The Sweat of Thy Face, had some wonderful statements that still hold water today. He said, "A philosophy is always some sort of a systematic attempt at interpreting the meaning of the totality of experience to give us ideals by which to direct our lives. Foundations for a philosophy are laid on a set of solid principles. From such a base, modifications or adjustments in keeping with the times, attuned to the syndromes of the era result in current applications in programming of innovations that maintain the integrity of those principles." So, in effect, he is saying that whatever it is that our philosophy is, it's got to be anchored to something, some kind of a set of firm principles. In effect, if I could paraphrase him, what he was saying is that profound experiences systematically interpreted are the roots of a philosophy. The task is for each to interpret philosophies of his own.

---

[4]American Vocational Association, Definition of Terms in Vocational and Practical Arts Education. (Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1954) p. 27.

David Snedden back in those days nicely summed it up when he said, "So we speak of an approach to a philosophy of vocational education through America's social ideals and problems as the determinants of the educative process based on a firm set of principles that can stand up to the heat of conflict and conjecture." Now, again, at this point in time we have an interface in terms of conflict and conjecture as to what it is that we are involved in this great and important work of vocational education.

So let's look at these founding principles. Let's examine the basis for a philosophy of vocational education.

A good place to begin would be with the theorems of vocational education that were postulated in the 30's by one of the founding fathers of vocational education, Charles A. Prosser. His 16 theorems were basic in his day. Can we challenge them in the light of today's activities or tomorrow's needs? If you will indulge me, let me read those 16 theorems to you. But as I do, think not of the 30's when they were postulated, but think of the problems that you face today and the work that you do in generating programs to meet the needs of our people. These are the theorems:

1. Vocational education will be efficient to the extent that the environment in which the learner is trained is a replica of the environment in which he must subsequently work.

2. Effective vocational training can only be given where the training jobs are carried on in the same way with the same operations, the same tools, and the same machines as in the occupation itself.

3. Vocational education will be effective to the extent that it trains the individual directly and specifically in the thinking habits and manipulative habits required in the occupation.

4. Vocational education will be effective to the extent that it enables each individual to capitalize on his own interests, aptitudes, and intrinsic intelligence.

5. Effective vocational education for any profession, calling, trade, occupation, or job can only be given to the selective group of individuals who need it, want it, and are able to profit by it.

6. Vocational training will be effective to the extent that specific training experiences for forming right habits of doing and thinking are repeated to the point that these habits become fixed to the degree necessary for gainful employment.

7. Vocational education will be effective to the extent that the instructor has the successful experience in the application of skills and knowledge to the operations and processes that he undertakes to teach.

8. For every occupation there is a minimum of productive ability which an individual must possess in order to secure or retain employment in that occupation. If vocational education is not carried to that point with that individual it is neither personally nor socially effective.

9. Vocational education must recognize conditions as they are and must train individuals to meet the demands of the labor market even though it may be true that more efficient ways of conducting the occupation may be known and that better working conditions are highly desirable.

10. The effective establishment of processed habits in any learner will be secured in proportion as the training is given on actual jobs and not on exercises or pseudo jobs.

11. The only reliable source of content for specific training in an occupation is in the experiences of masters of that occupation.

12. For every occupation there is a body of content which is peculiar to that occupation and which practically has no functioning value in any other occupation.

13. Vocational education will render efficient social service to the extent that it meets the specific training needs of any group at the time they are needed, and in such a way that they can most effectively profit by the instruction.

14. To be socially efficient, vocational education must take into consideration the particular characteristics of any particular group which it serves.

15. The administration of vocational education will be efficient to the extent that it is elastic and fluid rather than rigid and standardized.

16. While every reasonable effort should be made to reduce per capita cost, there is a minimum below which effective vocational education cannot be given, and if the course does not permit of this minimum of per capita cost, vocational education cannot be attempted.

These were Prosser's original 16 theorems of vocational education. We can stand them up and equate them to the requirements of our own times. We have to ask ourselves the question, Do they hold up? Will they work?

Inherent in the statements that were made by Prosser is a combination of steadfastness of purpose coupled with flexibility to match conditions as they change around us. How does this philosophy match up with yours? Do those points hold tight in your philosophy? Have you made some modifications or have you thrown them all over and sought for some new set of statements on which to hang your hat?

I believe that they are as sound and viable today as they were the day they were drafted!! In any period of change, certain pressures are placed on individuals which tend to either strengthen or modify the philosophy of that individual. In times such as these when we are all subject to the turbulence of technology in transition and the social syndromes that are indicative of our times, we must be in a position to state our own philosophies in a forthright manner. In order to do so, we have to bring to bear all of our experiences and our beliefs and our understandings to help guide us in the job that we're destined to do at this important point in time. Therein lies the challenge for all of us to be knowledgeable in our field in terms of the trends that shape the future because that is where all your activity takes place.

In the light of such trends, we have to give consideration to our mission in the field of vocational-technical education. We must show concern for the "continuum of vocational education's needy", from the vocationally talented to the reluctant learner to the disadvantaged learner. We must balance the needs with programs. Ours must be a concern for the groups to be served and our vision must not be limited by some narrow range of opportunities. Once our mission is recognized it is not difficult for us to move ahead, if we have a sound philosophy based on some sound principles.

Where do we go from here? The challenge I think can only be answered in the light of your own situation. This is the opportunity for your "flexibility quotient" to begin to show. Are you an effective change agent? Can you cope with the demands that call for programs that are different from what we now offer? Can you sell a program to meet tomorrow's needs and still live with your philosophy of vocational education? Here is your test of leadership. This is where your philosophy becomes operative.

In the light of that which preceded, let us look at emerging concepts and philosophies that are being set forth today. Here we have to be concerned with the interface between innovations and philosophy, between programs and principles, and not mix our metaphors talking about approaches, methodology, programming, and educational technology in terms of shifting parameters for our philosophy.

What is on the horizon today? We hear many statements being made about vocational education. Let us explore a few of these statements.

"Vocational training and preparation can best be done at the work place in the environment of employment." Where do we hear those words? They are a part of the promotion of the National Association of Businessmen's Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program, a part of the Manpower Development Training Act-On Job Training proposals. In effect, it is being said that the private sector has the jobs, therefore the private sector should supply the training for those jobs because it is in the best posture to do so. Do we accept that as a statement that we can live with? Can we apply all of the principles that we consider to be sound principles of vocational education in such an environment? Or are there missing pieces as evidenced by the fact that as some of these programs begin to evolve across the country we find the industries turning to the vocational educators in their communities saying one little word, "Help!" There are some who say that this is the new philosophy of vocational education. Is this a new philosophy?

Here is another statement that is being made. "Because the traditional school has stimulated failure syndromes in the disadvantaged, vocational preparation for them should take place in a new institutional setting with a philosophy of self-help and boot-strapping to provide new motivation in a segregated setting." This we have seen emerge in some of the MDTA programs where we've generated new training centers. We have seen this grow with the requests for proposals that are floated by the Manpower Administration to the private sector, trying to find new ways to build institutions for vocational training. We have seen this blossom in the Opportunities Industrialization Centers concept where new institutions have emerged.

Here is another statement. "Vocational education can flourish more rapidly and reach more people through individualized and relevant secondary education, through a curriculum that is cost effective, learner centered, characterized as modularized with merged curricula flexibility of scheduling, and with behavioral objectives utilizing multi-media approaches." That is quite a statement. It is the basic theme of the Educational Systems for the 70's approach. They are nice words. You can diagram it out nicely with inputs and outputs and all kinds of modifiers in between, but what does it mean? Is it a new philosophy, a new concept? If we listen to our colleagues promoting the ES 70 approach, we begin to hear them say that they have invented a whole new philosophy and system of vocational education that establishes an area of choice, a modularization that allows people to flow in and out of selected modules according to their desires whether they be planning to enter that occupational area or not.

We could go on with a number of statements of this kind. Statements that re-shuffle some of the language that we have used when we have talked about comprehensive integrated programs of vocational education. The pertinent question remains. Do such statements present a new and viable philosophy or do they indicate programming modifiers? There are many innovations and movements but do they bespeak a basic change in our philosophy or posture, or are they modifications or adaptations in keeping with the times?

Now lest I be considered facetious and derogatory in making the points that I have made, let me hasten to add that I am fulfilling a role as a stimulator and a devil's advocate for the discussion that follows. My references to these programs or attacks on current problems were made in the context of relating them to our principles and philosophies of vocational education.

There are some significant movements either now with us or on the horizon that have implications for vocational education; meaningful implications that could bring about some modifiers in our philosophy of vocational education.

Just to highlight a few:

- The upward and downward extension of vocational education.

On the one hand, available for all to see, has been the movement in the post-secondary direction. There are some who take the position that all vocational education should be postured at this level.

On the other hand, there is emerging a concern for a pre-secondary thrust--one that provides for occupational exposures and work experience in a pre-vocational sense. There are many who see such an approach as a means of stemming the drop-out tide by providing relevant and meaningful educational experiences with built in guidance factors.

- The micro-vocational approach.

In order to build-in achievable success factors that provide pathways to employment for some who could be classified as less advantaged we are experiencing a job re-engineering thrust that breaks down major occupational blocks into digestible segments. Thus the less advantaged are provided an opportunity to achieve levels of skill and knowledge needed to perform effectively in such entry jobs.

When fully developed, such a schema provides for multiple outlets within an occupational category with exits scattered along the programs continuum for those who plateau according to their individual capabilities.

- The job cluster approach.

We have experienced the emergence of the cluster approach in the broad areas of the technologies. Similarly, we now see the emergence of broad skills clusters in preparation for a range of jobs. The focus here is on the development of areas of common knowledge and skills having application in a group of related jobs thus providing flexibility for placement in a range of entry jobs.

- The extension of cooperative programs.

Cooperative programs involving schools and employers in both the public and private sectors now expand to include the disabled and the disadvantaged as well as the average student. The prognosis is for further extension and expansion into a wider range of occupational areas involving a greater segment of vocational students.

- The growth of inter-discipline or cross training programs.

The impact of technology and the re-engineering of jobs places added requirements for expanded ranges of knowledge and competence to meet job demands calling for an interleaving of elements of heretofore separate programs.

- The pre-vocational schema.

As vocational educators expand their horizons to include programming for the range of persons to be served, the need for pre-vocational conditioning has been underscored. This is especially true as the focus sharpens on the needs of the out-of-school disadvantaged and the in-school culturally deprived. Work orientation and work experience programs as conditioners for more demanding vocational education programs become imperative.

At this point in time, when National interest focuses on vocational education and its contribution to human resources development we become increasingly aware of our responsibility to match our actions to the economic and social pressures of the era. As we observe and participate in a series of evolutions, innovations, and movements designed to attack the economic and social problems of our day our philosophy and principles of vocation are once again being tested in the heat of conflict and conjecture.

So, Whither goest thou? How does your philosophy? When have you last assessed and tested it? Can it stand up to heat and pressure of the times?

My own philosophy, anchored on the base of Prosser's Theorems, comes through like this:

> "Vocational Education is a phase of the general development of the individual. For those individuals who ultimately will enter occupations below the professional level, vocational education grows in importance because of its occupational orientation and focus on preparation for employment.
>
> "Based on the fundamental concept of the dignity and worth of the individual in a democracy, vocational education serves a wide continuum of youth and adults through a range of programs designed to provide the opportunity to pursue and achieve success in the occupation of their choice in keeping with their own needs and capabilities as individuals and with the manpower needs of community, State, and Nation. Therefore, by providing an equality of opportunity for "the pursuit of excellence" in preparation for a wide range of occupations requiring varying levels of competence, vocational education is dedicated to the fullest development of the human resources of our Nation.
>
> "Vocational education serves as a 'change agent' through its emphasis upon flexibility to enable each individual to adapt to changing needs in preparation for and upgrading within an occupation; through its mobility and adaptability in providing specific training in time of crisis or disaster; and through its ability to shift emphasis, without destructive time lapse, whenever called upon to contribute to the maintenance of the Nation's welfare and security.
>
> "To achieve its objective, vocational education must provide for the integration of learning, both vocational and academic, so that it reflects the economic, cultural, sociological, and technological developments that affect the future security, prosperity, and happiness of our people, and the position of the United States in the world of Nations."